

REMARKS

The amendment to claim 1 is supported by the specification disclosure at page 22:41. The amendments to claims 4 and 5 simply restate these claims in process terms. No new matter is introduced.

It is respectfully submitted that the additional word “conventional” indicates to the skilled artisan the nature and range of additives contemplated by the present claims. This is especially in view of the numerous examples given therein. Applicants do not consider the claims to have been narrowed.

Similarly, applicants respectfully submit that the format change in claims 4 and 5 simply restate the subject matter, and do not narrow the claims. These amendments are urged to be sufficient to remedy the examiner’s concerns under 35 USC §112, ¶2 and 35 USC §101.

In rejecting claims 1-6 under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Idel et al. (US 5,231,124) in view of Lausberg et al. (US 4,791,158), the examiner implicitly asserts that the “phosphorous containing stabilizer[s]” in Idel are identical to those in the present claims. However, the present claims are drawn to compositions having specific phosphonite stabilizers given in the formula (I) of claim 1. Idel, in turn, employs specific phosphite stabilizers. These groups of phosphorous-containing stabilizers are not identical, and Idel makes no suggestion that the phosphite stabilizers disclosed therein could be replaced with the phosphonite stabilizers of the present claims. Neither has any teaching in the art been established which would suggest such a substitution.

As Lausberg is employed in a supportive role, and as it also employs a different

WEBER et al., Serial No. 10/018,341

stabilizer, the present invention is not obvious, even with consideration of this reference. Further, as each reference requires certain components, it is not clear that one of skill in the art would be motivated to combine any one portion from one reference with the disclosed components of the other reference. The combination would defeat the purposes of each disclosed invention, respectively. Accordingly, the present claims are not obvious over the combined disclosure of Idel and Lausberg.

Additionally, the present stabilizers impart unexpected heat resistance and processing stability when compared to the prior art. The following table, drawn from data reported on page 25 of the specification makes this more clear. Examples 1C and 2, 2C and 1, and 3C and 3 have similar composition, with examples 1, 2, and 3 containing the present stabilizer.

	1C	2	2C	1	3C	3
$E_r$	44	102	78	122	34	105
$W_{50}$	53	88	87	93	35	65

Further, the full width at half maximum ( $T_{1/2}$ ) of the recrystallization peaks are almost half the area of the original peaks.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants consider that the rejections of record have been obviated and respectfully solicit passage of the application to issue.

**Please find attached a check for \$110.00 for a one month extension of time.**

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this

WEBER et al., Serial No. 10/018,341

paper, including Extension of Time fees to Deposit Account No. 11-0345. Please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KEIL & WEINKAUF

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David C. Liechty', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

David C. Liechty  
Reg. No. 48,692

1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202)659-0100

DCL/lc